



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,600	02/18/2004	Ryan Alan Munson	M61.12-0539	2670

27366 7590 04/30/2007  
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)  
SUITE 1400  
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/30/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/781,600

Applicant(s)

MUNSON ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 17 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 6-35.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
APU MOFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding to applicant's argument on pages 7-8 of the remarks, Kobayashi clearly discloses: obtaining a role-specific data set that representing a role assumed by the constituent as employee no, password, home directory, logging id and personal information (col. 5, lines 6-24); obtaining a second role-specific data set representing a second role by the constituent (i.e., as when the item access rights are set in units of user groups, a department manager and personal staff are allowed to access to all the items of the employee information file, col. 6, lines 65 to col. 7, lines 4); storing the second role-specific data set so as to be separate from said role-specific data set and the core data set (i.e., allow to set two different record access conditions, each record access condition is described using a login expression obtained by connecting a data item name to a condition value using a comparison operation... that is department indicates that the user belongs to the same department. When a plurality of record access conditions are set in each area... col. 7, lines 41-55, Kobayashi).

Regarding to applicant's argument on page 9 of the remarks, Kobayashi clearly discloses: obtaining a role specific data set only containing data that is different than the data stored in the core data set and obtaining a second role specific data set only containing data that is different from the data stored in the role specific and core data sets as i.e., allow to set two different record access conditions, each record access condition is described using a login expression obtained by connecting a data item name to a condition value using a comparison operation... that is department indicates that the user belongs to the same department. When a plurality of record access conditions are set in each area... col. 7, lines 41-55, Kobayashi.

Regarding to applicant's argument on claim rejections 35 U.S.C 103(a) on pages 10-11 of the remarks, Kobayashi associates roles with access rights and does not create role specific records, this limitation was not clearly discloses in the claim.

Response to argument that Kobayashi also does not each or suggest gathered from an interaction with a constituent acting in a first capacity, as well as information gathered from the subsequent interaction with the constituent acting in a capacity different than the first. However, Examiner rejected this claim as 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection over Kobayashi in view of Win. Win clearly discloses: wherein the data includes information gathered from an interaction with a constituent acting in a first capacity, as well as information gathered from the subsequent interaction with the constituent acting in a capacity different than the first(role may reflect a relationship of a user to the organization (col. 13, lines 54-67, Win). The motivation being to enable the system to prove the roles for each user and developed capacities in which a person might act when they access the resources and their functional group, department or organization unit.

Response to argument that Kobayashi also does not each or suggest maintaining a record of relationships between constituent and role specific records, Win however clearly discloses: maintaining a record of relationships between constituent and role specific records as for example consider a user who is defined in the registry repository as having a record type of user, a record name of Harvey and a role of Hotline staff. A field in the admin role record specifies whether that user is assigned the "configuration privilege", this privilege allows an administrator to configure and maintain servers in the system, col. 16, lines 47-57, Win)..